Amendment dated August 4, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2010

Page 9 of 13

Remarks

Claims 1, 7-9, 15-17 and 23-32 are pending in this application. Of these, claims

1, 9 and 17 are independent claims.

Claims 3, 5, 11, 13, 19 and 21 have been cancelled.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate limitations formerly in claim 3. The

language "selected ones of said predefined groups" has been changed to "a selected

one of said predefined groups" for consistency within the remainder of the amended

claim. Corresponding independent claims 9 and 17 have been similarly amended.

The dependencies of claims 28, 30 and 32 have been amended in view of the

cancellation of claims 3, 11 and 19 respectively.

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure as non-

compliant with 37 CFR 1.74 for failing to refer to FIGS. 20MMM-20PPP. The Applicant

has amended paragraph 0038 of the specification to recite FIGS. 20A-20PPP.

Withdrawal of the objection is therefore requested.

At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17, 19, 21, 23

and 31-32 under 35 USC 101 on the basis that "machine-readable medium" could

include signals in transmission, which have been held to be non-statutory. The

Examiner suggested that the Applicant amend the claims to recite "non-transitory

machine-readable medium" and indicated that the suggested amendment will not be

considered as new matter. Accordingly, the Applicant has amended claims 17, 23 and

Amendment dated August 4, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2010

Page 10 of 13

31-32 as suggested. Similar amendments have been made to claims 24 and 26, for  $\,$ 

consistency with the other machine-readable medium claims, despite the lack of any

formal rejection of those claims.

No new matter is believed to have been added by any of these amendments.

At page 3 the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 17, 19 and

25-32 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over US 2003/0204842 ("Chenelle") in

view of US 2002/0069263 ("Sears"). The Applicant traverses these rejections on the

basis that no prima facie obviousness has been established in respect of any of the

claims as amended. In particular, two limitations of the independent claims are not

shown by the identified portions of the cited references.

The first limitation of the independent claims that is not shown as alleged is

"automatically transmitting a message over a wireless connection to a set of wireless

communications devices indicating that said  $\underline{\text{new}}$  application is available" (emphasis

added). At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledged that Chenelle does  $\,$ 

not teach automatically transmitting in response to a new application being made

available at a server. However, the Examiner suggested that Sears 0042 teaches

automatically transmitting a message indicating a new application in response to the

new application being made available at a server. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Sears' messages pertain to new <u>versions</u> of applications (i.e. <u>updated</u> applications), not new applications. Therefore Sears does not disclose the limitation in question.

The second limitation of the independent claims that is not shown as alleged is

Amendment dated August 4, 2010

Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2010

Page 11 of 13

added to a group of applications associated with the selected one of said predefined groups of wireless communications devices" (emphasis added). This limitation was formerly in claim 3 but has been promoted to claim 1 by way of the present response. In respect of former claim 3, the Examiner stated, at page 6 of the Office Action, that Chenelle teaches "a group of applications associated with the selected one of said predefined groups of wireless communication devices." The Examiner acknowledged that Chenelle does not teach "wherein said automatically transmitting is conditional upon said new application being added to the group of applications [that is associated]

"wherein said automatically transmitting is conditional upon said new application being

with the selected one of said predefined groups of wireless communications devices]."

However, the Examiner stated that Sears does teach "automatically transmitting a notification of a new application upon said new application being added to a group of

applications" (emphasis added), implying that the above quoted limitation was shown.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Upon close examination, it can be seen that there is actually discrepancy between what is purportedly shown in Sears, i.e. the automatic transmission of a notification upon the adding of an application to a group of applications, and the claim language, which requires automatic transmitting to be conditional upon a new application being added to a group of applications <u>associated</u> with the selected one of the predefined groups of wireless communications devices. An advantage of the claimed approach is that, merely by adding a new application to a group of applications (e.g. to a "sales" group of applications associated with a sales department of an enterprise), a notification indicating that a new application is available

Amendment dated August 4, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2010

Page 12 of 13

can responsively be sent to each device of the group (e.g. to each mobile device

assigned to a member of a sales department of an enterprise). There is no need for

any per-device or per-user requesting of notifications regarding the availability of new

applications. In contrast, Sears appears to require each individual user to request

notifications regarding new versions of applications, via a "user profile log" (see

paragraph 0042). This may be comparatively onerous, especially if the number of users

is large.

In view of the absence of these limitations from the identified portions of the

cited art, no prima facie case of obviousness has been established against the

independent claims or, by logical implication, against any of the dependent claims.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection is therefore requested.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of the

application are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10/537,621 Amendment dated August 4, 2010 Reply to Office Action of May 5, 2010 Page 13 of 13

Respectfully submitted,

Peter Elyjiw Registration No. 58,893

SMART & BIGGAR
438 University Avenue
Suite 1500, Box 111
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5G 2K8

Telephone: (416) 593-5514 Facsimile: (416) 591-1690

Date: August 4, 2010 PAE/ibs 93422-48